



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

pute of having eclipsed the whole human race in feats of valor and deeds of arms?"

"This is a serious question. It affects the vital interests of every freeman; and the course of our government makes it necessary, that these States should pause and reflect, before it be too late. We have escaped from one war with a crippled constitution; the next will probably destroy it; therefore let the motto of the state be—PEACE."

These extracts may suffice for a specimen of what warriors themselves have thought of their own profession; and, could we trace the whole course of war, and look into the hearts of its greatest demigods, we should probably find, that most of them regarded it in their best moments with disgust and abhorrence. Ancient heroes reflected little on the nature and results of this custom; but modern warriors rarely, if ever, attempt to justify it, except as a last expedient for protection or redress. Even they are the advocates of peace, and look upon themselves as its armed guardians, and upon the military system of Christendom as the best means of preventing war. They are sadly mistaken on this point; but their view of it shows how general and deep is the abhorrence among civilized men of a custom so savage and baleful.

ARTICLE III.

PREJUDICES IN FAVOR OF WAR.

THE PREJUDICES OF EDUCATION IN FAVOR OF WAR, AND THE BEST WAY TO COUNTERACT THEM.

THE advocates of peace, like other reformers, have found that the prejudices of education are among the most serious obstacles to the cause they seek to promote. From infancy to manhood, the mind is exposed to influences which tend to bias it in favor of war. It is maintained that, so long as these continue to operate, the abolition of this custom, so ruinous to the temporal and spiritual interests of men, cannot reasonably be expected.

But before an evil can be removed, it must be exposed. It will, therefore, be my object, in this essay, to treat of the prejudices of education in favor of war, and suggest the means by which they may be counteracted.

In the first place, I shall attempt to show the *fact* that such prejudices exist, and the *manner* in which they are inculcated.

These prejudices chiefly pertain to the *lawfulness*, the *necessity*, and the *glory* of war. They are *gradually* formed as knowledge is acquired, and they gain strength as the intellectual and moral character is developed. From age to age they have existed, and have alike been excited and confirmed by impressions made on the youthful mind, by parents and teachers, by respected clergymen and popular orators, by arts and literature, by military establishments, and the omnipotent voice of public opinion. That these prejudices may be distinctly seen, I shall present them *separately*, while it must be remembered that they often act *in concert* from the cradle to the full development of mind.

No principle is oftener inculcated, or supposed to be more firmly established, than that war may be, and often has been, *right*. Wherever we turn our eyes, we see youth indoctrinated, even by the most honored and beloved in the community, in the lawfulness of war. The disposition to view favorably this custom is implanted in the nursery. The boy, before he is able to solve a moral question of difficulty, is told exciting stories of the warfare of his fathers ;—how gallantly the minister of the parish, perhaps, headed, like a bishop of feudal times, the armed yeomanry, and incited them to revenge and slaughter. He hears, with peculiar interest, his worthy old grandmother relate the noble deeds of her husband, or father, or brothers in “that righteous cause,” the American Revolution ; or he beholds over the mantel-piece the engraved image of “the father of his country” splendidly arrayed in military costume, or else, what is not less imposing, his head encircled by winged angels with a laurel crown. When he reads his Bible, he is often directed to those passages which record the heroic exploits of the illustrious leaders in the Jewish theocracy, or the praises of the Israelitish women who sung, “Saul hath slain his thousands, but David his tens of thousands,” without being told that those heroes were appointed by God as instruments of punishment against idolatrous Canaanites, just as angels were sent to destroy the cities of the plain. With what interest does the youth, when he first reads the beautiful allegory of Bunyan, contemplate the ideal conflicts of Christian and Great Heart, without being instructed in their spiritual import ! If he is permitted to hear the inflated eloquence, which is too often poured forth in the temple of the Prince of peace on our great national jubilee, he hears of nought but exalted virtues developed in a

battle-field, or of a patriotism which, when rightly viewed, may be nothing but the desire of elevating one's country at the cost of another's, regardless of the injury to the moral and spiritual interests of both.

But there are more direct influences which operate on the mind, and lead to the persuasion that war is right. As soon as the youth is taught to study and discuss great ethical subjects, he is indoctrinated in the fundamental error, "that a distinction exists between the rules which apply to us as individuals, and as citizens of the state;—that the pacific injunctions of Christ from the mount, and all other kindred commands and prohibitions of the Scriptures, have no reference to our conduct as members of the political body;" in other words, that a public man, or body of men, may lawfully do what could not, on the principles of the gospel, be justified in a private individual. He is constantly told, that a nation, though composed of individuals who are bound to obey, even unto death, the settled laws of truth and justice as enforced by the precepts and final example of Christ and his apostles, *has no conscience!* and hence, forsooth, because one nation sets at defiance the laws of God, because the world is bad, force must be opposed to force, evil may be resisted with evil! Dr. Paley says, and the notion is frequently believed and taught, "that in the transactions of *private* persons, no advantages can *compensate* to the public from a breach of the settled laws of justice; but, in the *concerns of empires*, this may safely be doubted,—nay, even that it may be necessary for Christians to resign themselves to a common will, though that will is often actuated by criminal motives, and determined to destructive purposes!" That is, if it appears, *on the maxims of expediency*, to the rulers of a nation that war is desirable, all the individuals of that nation are bound by duty to encourage that war, however base the motives which may really have caused it, and disastrous it may prove to the best interests of mankind!! If good may come from slaughtering men, women and children, we may slaughter them! If good may result from stratagem and crime, we may practise them! Oh, when shall good men learn and teach the universality of Christian obligation! How long shall the philosophy of expediency supplant the plain injunctions of the gospel! How long shall the wisdom of this world be more valued than the oracles of God!

But not only enlightened and approved ethical writers, on the principle "that whatever is expedient is right," inculcate the lawfulness of war, but the honored man of God lifts up his

voice to confirm the general delusion. Says Robert Hall, in one of his printed discourses, "Go then, ye defenders of your country; advance with alacrity into the field where God himself musters the hosts to war. *Religion* is too much interested in your success not to lend you her aid. She will shed over this enterprise her selectest influence. And thou, sole Ruler among the children of men, go forth with our hosts in the day of battle! Impart, in addition to their hereditary valor, that confidence which springs from thy presence, and pour into their hearts the spirit of departed heroes." Who, surely, could suppose that this declamation was uttered by a man who also had preached and published one of the best sermons on the evils of war which has ever been written?

But the principle, that war is in accordance with the will of God, is more eagerly cherished by the people; and, among that class with which the youth is most prone to mingle, it is assumed as a first truth. How many believe that war is right, because the American Revolution was successfully achieved. Every where we hear it spoken of as "the righteous cause which heaven befriended;" "the good and glorious war;" "the most illustrious event recorded in the annals of mankind!" O, how differently the English thought, and how differently our posterity may also think, when the moral evils it gave rise to, are more fully developed, when the pacific principles of Christianity are more distinctly perceived!

But the prejudices of education respecting *the necessity of war* are more prevalent, and, if possible, more deeply rooted. They exist wherever the principles of expediency are disseminated and cherished. They are indeed founded on them. They are so intimately connected with the maxims of worldly wisdom, that wherever the latter are recognised as settled rules of action, it is maintained that only the law of violence can secure the safety and prosperity of nations; and hence it has become the fundamental principle of international policy.

But, as few vindicate slavery from principle, so no good and enlightened man approves of war for its own sake. In every age and country, it has been regarded as a great calamity. It is so unequivocally a scourge, that nearly all conquerors have sought excuses,—pitiful indeed,—whereby they might justify themselves in the eye of the world. But while it has been "denounced as a curse, and decried as an evil," its necessity has been maintained as a remedy for the greater evils of oppression and slavery. The warlike policy has usually been defended as *the means*, dictated by reason

and experience, to secure *ultimate advantage*. Hence its immediate consequences have been viewed as *necessary evils*, and therefore patiently endured, just as the sick man swallows the loathsome drug, in the hope of a more speedy recovery ; or as we calmly view the commotion of the elements, in the quiet expectation of a more prolific soil, and a more salubrious sky. Such are the views of the most enlightened defenders of war.

And here I have no reference to prejudices respecting the *end* to be attained, but simply as to the *means* usually adopted to secure that end. It would surely be the worst of delusions to suppose we are not bound to do all we can to secure our country's true honor and advantage. I wish to show the *fact*, that the *law of violence* is every where inculcated in the system of instruction, instead of the *law of love*. A discussion of their comparative efficacy is foreign to my present object.

From the cradle to the grave, we are taught to regard the warlike policy as the vital principle of national preservation. This is upheld by the whole range of literature, ancient and modern. Every body knows it was a favorite notion with the poets, orators, historians, and sages of antiquity, that the prosperity of the state depended on the power and disposition to enforce the law of violence. Hence it was made the elementary principle of their institutions. The texture of these institutions is the subject of classical and philosophical study. We are early indoctrinated in the principle on which they are based. Its truth is rarely questioned. Hence we are generally taught, particularly in our histories, that the prosperity of the states of antiquity is mainly to be ascribed to their warlike energies. It is seldom that we are pointed to the industry, knowledge, virtue, and numbers of the *middling classes* as primary causes of prosperity ; or to the vices of self-interest, the extinction of the middling classes, disproportionate fortunes, and the absorbing *spirit of egotism*, as primary causes of corruption and decay. We are seldom pointed, either by our teachers or our books, to the real canker-worm which devoured the vitals of the great states of antiquity ; but we blindly ascribe their ruin to the extinction of a martial spirit, or some other secondary cause. Thus we say that it was the arms of Cyrus, not the virtues and uncorrupted strength of his countrymen, which gave life and energy to the Persian monarchy. Thus we speak of the sun of Athenian glory going down at the battle of Cheronea, and tell our youth that, when the Grecians loved arts, and eloquence, and philosophy, and poetry more than the battle-field, liberty and renown left them for ever. We are early impressed

with the idea that, when the imperial eagle stopped its flight over the forests of Germany, and the god of war ceased to be the presiding genius of the "eternal city," she lost her essential principle of vitality; and when she hurled her last weapon, impotent as the dart of Priam "amid the crackling ruins of Troy," at her triumphant foe, we behold the energy of the Teutonic tribes, rather than her own weakness and decrepitude.

In the middle ages, also, we are taught to recognise the same principle of preservation. Hallam ascribes the renovation of Europe, from the anarchy which succeeded the fall of the Roman empire, to the feudal system,—that organized system of perpetual warfare, and miserable oppression. But we read that the Provençal and Norman poets excited the barbarians by their amorous strains; that the spirit of gallantry in conjunction with other causes, modified the law of violence; and that then there arose an institution which imparted life and interest to the Germanic character. But what is the charm with which chivalry has ever been invested? It is simply martial enthusiasm. We are taught to admire its spirit, though we cannot always approve of its developments;—that is, though we may condemn the crusades, we commend and encourage the spirit which caused and sustained them. We ascribe the manly energy of the European character to the influence of chivalry, while we often scarcely notice the effects of commercial enterprise, of agriculture, of religious zeal, or even of those natural energies, those elements of a noble character, which the Europeans inherited from their fathers, and which needed only the influence of civilization and Christianity to develop them.

If we glance at modern times, we are taught to ascribe the same excellence to the warlike policy. Though the fetters of the serf were unlocked, the gentler sex elevated to their proper rank, and a substance and a soul imparted to the people from the influence of union, and knowledge, and religion, still we recognise no other settled principle, in international transactions, but the law of violence. War continued to be, as in pagan times, "the master passion of the people, the master spring of the government." We defend it as the means of glory as at Blenheim, or of liberty as at Bunker Hill. We even ascribe many of the legitimate benefits of the Reformation to those bloody and countless wars which grew out of the agitated passions of men. What would have become of the reformed religion, it is triumphantly asked by all historians, had not the Protestant princes of Europe united to oppose the Catholic

league, and humble the overweening power of Austria? We think not of the time when the religion of the cross silently emanated to all parts of the world, and triumphed over all the powers of darkness,—over all the dark prejudices, the tumultuous passions, the corrupt affections, and the pride of the human heart. Again it is confidently asked, what would have become of the rights of man, had the great conqueror been suffered to perform his “stupendous tragedy,” unmolested by the embattled hosts of Europe? And because we, in our wisdom, cannot see *how* Providence might have prevented his terrible career, we assume as a fundamental principle, that the harmony and security of Christendom could be maintained only by the voluntary immolation of millions to the demon of destruction. The belief in this principle is so general, and so deeply rooted in the minds of men, that, were a peaceful philanthropist to suggest to the rulers of the earth any other means of national security, he would be almost deemed a fool. Nations have not yet discovered any final way to settle their differences but by the sword, and dream of no remedy for oppression, but sanguinary and uncompromising resistance. Retaliation is the favorite maxim of political wisdom. It is thought *necessary* to resist evil *with* evil. Force *must* be opposed by force, according to the precepts which are constantly inculcated, not by history merely, not by philosophy alone, but by the most sagacious in civil life, the most virtuous statesmen, the respected ministers of God. “The human race,” says Chief Justice Marshall, “would be eminently benefited by the principles of peace. The religious man, and the philanthropist must equally pray for their establishment. Yet I must avow my belief, that the pacific adjustment of national differences is impracticable.” Such are the sentiments inculcated even by enlightened civilians. We should almost be confounded at such testimony, did it not come from the biographer of a revolutionary hero, though a good and a great man, and did we not know, as Elihu hath said, “that great men are not always wise, neither do the aged understand judgment.”

Such is the proof of the existence of the prejudices in favor of the necessity of war, and among all classes in the community, taught, not by books alone, but by the directory of public opinion. From the general recognition of the law of violence as the essential principle of international policy, we point with the finger of pride to the vast ship which bears its thousand warriors, and its hundred pieces of artillery. We say it is our glory and our defence. How few dispute the fact! Thither

the pious mother sends her son, at the age of fourteen, to be trained to the discipline and maxims of naval life. Thither resorts the minister of Christ, to study the oracles of God amid the jests and the gibes of the ward-room. From the recognition of this principle we point with triumph to the expensive fortification which defends almost every harbor, and view with peculiar pleasure the soldier who promenades the graveled out-works, and the heavy ordnance which surmount the impenetrable walls. From the prevalence of this principle we encourage the whole mimicry of war, and vindicate the support of the militia system as a patriotic duty, though we admit that every review is injurious to the morals of the community. In view of this great law of nations we glory in our military academies, and support the corrupting standing army on our boundaries. To perpetuate this law, we erect the granite pile over the graves of heroes, and celebrate, with songs of festivity, the bloody battles of our fathers. Such are some of the influences which operate on the minds of youth, and form those invincible prejudices respecting the necessity of war which we cannot but observe wherever we go, in the city and the country, among the high and the low, the rich and the poor, in the halls of legislation, and in the temple of the Prince of peace.

But these prejudices, though supported with the greatest force of authority and argument, are not the most effective in biasing the mind in favor of war. Let us consider those, in the next place, which pertain to the glory of successful warfare, and the honorable estimation of the profession of arms.

If war is generally deemed just and necessary, then it follows, of course, that the profession of arms should be accounted honorable. The warrior is thought to be preëminently the defender of his country's liberties, and the promoter of its glory. As he risks his life in the service of the state, it is supposed that patriotism fills his bosom. Hence military enthusiasm, in the apprehension of many, is synonymous with patriotism. The world over the soldier is called a patriot, no matter how degraded he may be by his vices, or ruinous his ambition to the best interests of his fellow creatures; while he who, in the cause of literature, science, arts, or religion, may not "have counted his own life dear unto him," perhaps may pass for a good or a great man, but not so deserving of his country's gratitude and praise as the successful warrior. To be but enrolled in the army or navy, ensures attention and respect. All over Christendom, officers take the lead in fashionable ranks. What-

ever may be their moral and intellectual culture, they are welcomed into the best society. The gilded epaulet is every where a wonderful talisman. It attracts the gaze of the vulgar. It excites the admiration of the young. It causes the face of beauty to kindle with smiles. It exacts the tribute of respect from age and rank. What boy pants not for such a prize? And who that feels the glow of ambition, does not seek for eminence in his profession,—in an honorable profession? Hence he who is most skillful in “scattering firebrands, arrows, and death,” is called the greatest hero, and is, consequently, the most lauded. And, says Gibbon, “so long as the destroyers of mankind are deemed more honorable than the benefactors, the thirst of military glory will ever be the vice of the most exalted characters.”

This truth the history of humanity confirms. Military glory, in all ages of the world, has been prized above all other honors. Its value is continually presented. It is held forth, in our most valued literature, as the noblest object of ambition. To kindle desire, and excite respect for the warrior's excellence, have been employed all the powers of mind,—has been prostituted the genius of the world. Who can estimate the influence of one single poem, the *Iliad*, that immortal, transcendent epic? How many Alexanders has it called into being! In how many bosoms, for nearly three thousand years, has it enkindled the fires of wrong ambition! What mighty effect has it had in turning the esteem of mankind from the humble, the beneficent, and the good, to the turbulent, the rash, and the unpitying! And of nearly all the Greek and Roman classics, the influence is similar. They generally create sympathy for deeds of military prowess. So it is with the popular literature of all countries. That which has come into existence even in the present century, often excites the love of warlike distinction. The imperishable works of *Homér* and *Xenophon* do not set forth the glory of the warrior in a more exciting manner, and are not more calculated to produce a martial ardor in the mind, than *Scott's Marmion*, or *Southey's Nelson*. Every thing which pertains to heroic action is still, as in ancient times, received with popular enthusiasm. Who is not familiar with *Ivanhoe*? What nation does not prize its heroic poems, its martial airs and ballads? To this day the Spanish peasant loves to repeat the exploits of the *Cid*. Even the Venetian gondoliers sing with the same enthusiasm the “*Jerusalem Delivered*,” as the countrymen of *Burns* do his “*Scots, wha ha' wi' Wallace bled*.” Every where we hear of the glory of the warrior. On him are

the honors of all countries lavished. The gratitude of England raised Wellington to the first rank of her nobility, and intrusted to his guidance the helm of her government. The warrior is exalted to the pinnacle of renown. His glories screen from the public eye the noblest and the best. He is styled the "patron of mankind." He lives the fond object of popular idolatry; and when he dies, we are told that "his intrepid spirit rises triumphantly from the field of glory to its kindred heavens!" Then his image is handed down to posterity in the animated marble, and his virtues in the poet's immortal lay.

"Thus fame has been achieved, renown on earth,
And what most merits fame, in silence hid."

But the youth not only hears the praises of the warrior's excellence; but, as if too great pains could not be taken to excite a warlike propensity, his early toys are mimic swords and drums. He is inflamed by the strains of martial music, and delighted with the parade of military reviews. Who will ever forget the intense exhilaration he felt when he first saw the train-band "with its order, and motion, and music, its feathers, and horsehair, and bearskin, and tinsel?" All the representations of war and of heroes are interesting and brilliant. Nothing seems more desirable to the common mind than situations in the army and navy. Wherever we go we behold something calculated to captivate the youthful mind. In the public hall we see the bust of the warrior, and over his grave the stately monument. Do we travel through the rural and quiet district? We behold, even in the bar-room, the figure of Napoleon. Do we seek an hour's entertainment from reading? The first book which arrests our attention, represents perhaps the hero as the benefactor of mankind. Do we view the youth at his academic task? He is cantering joyfully over

"Quadrupedante putrem sonitu quatit ungula campum."

Such are some of the influences which bias the mind in favor of war. The youth is first taught to respect the custom; then follows the desire for its honors. Let Christians beware how they encourage this martial ardor. Once enkindled, it is with difficulty extinguished. Though it may be called a patriotic impulse, it will nevertheless, like other impulses, seek a field for its development.

But whence these prejudices which I have endeavored to present? How came they to be so prevalent and generally

established? How happened such a fatal delusion to overspread the Christian world? What is its origin? A mere glance at the causes will explain the fact. When we view them, our wonder ceases at once.

They are the prejudices of our fathers. They are invested with all the authority and power which time and use can sanction. Who that has ever thought on the nature of the human mind, or the history of human conduct and opinions, is not impressed with the mysterious efficacy of that spell which is conjured by the suffrage of antiquity? But old and venerable as are these prejudices, they are only the relics of barbarism. The way they came to be established is so natural, that we feel no surprise.

In the early ages of the church, it is well known Christians deemed the custom of war irreconcilable with the spirit of the gospel. The discrepancy of the Christian and warlike character was then openly maintained, and generally believed, as conceded by all respectable historians. Even Gibbon says, "that they knew not how to reconcile even the defence of their persons and property to the patient doctrine which enjoined an unlimited forgiveness of past injuries. Their humane ignorance could not be persuaded that it was lawful, on any occasion, to take the blood of their fellow-creatures. Hence they refused to take part in the active defence of the empire; for they could not, without renouncing a most solemn duty, assume the character of soldiers." "But while it is as easy," says a learned writer of the seventeenth century, "to obscure the sun at mid-day, as to deny that the primitive Christians renounced all war as irreconcilable with their profession, still it is true, that so soon as Christianity became corrupt, even before it was seated on the throne of the Roman world, Christians became soldiers. When the Tartar and Teutonic barbarians invaded the civilized world, Christianity, though generally professed, had become so corrupted by pagan superstitions, and by the influence of oriental and Grecian philosophy, that its pure and simple principles could hardly be recognised. The gospel, of course, could not be expected to restrain a people from war who had so little perception of its truth, especially when they literally fought *pro aris et focis*." Much less influence could a merely nominal Christianity have on the conduct of those sensuous and energetic warriors of the north who settled in the countries they conquered, and whose very religion, like that of the savages of North America, was war. When these two races, the Ger-

manic and Roman, became blended together, institutions were formed, based entirely on the law of violence, which moulded gradually the habits of thought in subsequent generations. During the thousand years of turbulence, ignorance, and chaos which succeeded the fall of the Roman empire, war was supposed to be just, necessary and glorious. From these semi-barbarians we are descended. They have transmitted to us much of the spirit of their institutions. Many of those principles which they valued have descended to us, from various causes, complete and undisputed. Among these, are the prejudices respecting war. They are therefore stamped with the seal of antiquity. The influence of old opinions I have mentioned. They are with many received as true, because they are old, no matter whence derived, no matter how opposed to the great standard of truth which they profess to follow.

Again; the wars which are recorded in the *Old Testament*, and those maxims in the *New*, which pertain to the propriety of a coercive power in government, have favored the delusion as to the moral character of war. Superadded to the influence of these, are its supposed advantages, which hope ever suggests, and the corrupt inclinations of the heart, ever prone to seek indulgence at any cost.

Such is the origin of those prejudices, which the present system of education tends to perpetuate and confirm;—a system of instruction which favors a delusion more fatal and corrupt than the Christian philanthropist has hitherto detected among mankind. And the most melancholy reflection in view of it is, that Christians make so few exertions of a positive kind to counteract these prejudices. How few have lifted up their voice against war;—a custom which has caused more unmixed evil to the bodies and souls of men than has hitherto been exposed. Now and then, it is true, that the humane voice of an Erasmus, a Grotius, or a Knox, has been heard in almost every age; but how soon drowned by the discords of society, or unheeded by deluded man. Christians have seldom, as a class, recognised the law of love in international transactions.*

A. Z.

* “The Means of Counteraction,” in our next number.